

Conference Paper for the 12th Transatlantic Dialogue, SUBTHEME 2: 'Legitimacy, democracy and citizen engagement', 8-11 June 2016

THE DEMOCRATIC QUALITY OF CO-PRODUCTION IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT.

A pilot study in the Rabot neighbourhood in Ghent, Belgium.

Daphne Vanleene, Bram Verschuere & Joris Voets

Ghent University,
Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
Department of Public Governance, Management and Finance

I. INTRODUCTION: PROBLEM STATEMENT & RESEARCH QUESTION

This case study will be focusing on the democratic quality of co-production in the field of community development. Co-production, where (groups of) individual citizens and paid employees of an organisation work together in the design and implementation of public services at a local level (Brandsen & Honingh, 2015), has become a well-established topic that has been receiving a flurry of academic interest in the recent decades. Early scholars like Parks et al. (1981) and Ostrom (1996) built the foundation of this concept, which finds itself at a crossroads of different disciplines (e.g. sociologic research, public management research and studies in the voluntary sector), making it a crowded subject of research (Verschuere, Brandsen, & Pestoff, 2012).

As Verschuere et al. (2012) explain, there are three research lines within co-production research: the motives and profiles of co-producers, the co-production process, and the effects of co-production. Recently, the call for more research on co-production effects has been answered by Fledderus (2016) who researched the effects on trust and by Jakobsen (2013) who researched the equity of co-production in education. Yet, even with this growing interest, co-production research is still lacking in certain areas (Verschuere et al., 2012).

As the experts of their community, it is assumed that citizens can more easily provide answers and solutions to societal issues, called 'wicked' problems, e.g. health inequality, social exclusion and a fragmented, individualized society (Brandsen, Trommel, & Verschuere, 2014; Durose, 2011). Since it became clear that the government is no longer able to respond to these complex social issues alone, citizen participation projects and initiatives have steadily grown (Blakeley & Evans, 2009; Halvorsen, 2003; Wagenaar, 2007). An example is the introduction of the concept 'Big Society' proposed by the British prime-minister Cameron in 2010. With this concept he attempted to promote the idea of citizen groups, charities and government working together (Watt, 2010). Similarly, in 2013, the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Netherlands created a document to emphasise the government's intentions to be a partner and create a network with and between citizens and government (Ministerie van BZK, 2013).

Sceptics have criticised this new trend, claiming that citizen participation is solely used as an excuse to save on budget and time and allocate responsibility and accountability to the citizens. Again, 'Big Society' can be used as an example, as the concept by now has mostly disappeared from governmental discourse. Thus critics' initial claim, that this was all to justify cuts in government funding, seems to ring true (Butler, 2015; Watt, 2010). Nevertheless citizen participation projects keep spreading, from education (Jakobsen & Andersen, 2013) and healthcare (Pestoff, 2012; van Eijk & Steen, 2014) to taxation (Alford, 2002), housing (Brandsen & Helderman, 2012) and urban regeneration (Denters & Klok, 2010; Fung, 2004). While governments' response might be flawed still, through inconsistent use of language or uncertainty as to what their role in the process is, there are clear signs that many still believe that citizen participation is the solution to the 'wicked' problems of today (Bakker, 2015; de Boer, 2013).

In literature, when concepts such as 'citizen participation' or 'co-production' are used, the underlying connection with its democratic quality is always presumed, as citizen involvement is considered a virtue in itself (Bakker, 2015; Voorberg, Bekkers, & Tummers, 2014). This concept, 'democratic quality', is used mainly in philosophical and sociological literature (e.g. Putnam (2001) or Rousseau). However, for this study, we build on previous research and compose a definition of three different translations: inclusion (Agger & Larsen, 2009; Lombard, 2013; Michels, 2011; Young, 2000) empowerment (Buckwalter, 2014; de Graaf, van Hulst, & Michels, 2015; Fung, 2004; Halvorsen, 2003), and equity (Cuthill, 2010; Fung, 2004; Herian, Hamm, Tomkins, & Zillig, 2012; Jakobsen & Andersen, 2013; Webler & Tuler, 2000).

In the larger field of participation literature, numerous empirical studies have already studied the more pessimistic viewpoints: for example that the 'typical participant' is predominantly the white middle-aged middle-

class man (Sidney Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 1995), that people will most commonly act out of self-interest (e.g. the tragedy of commons, prisoners' dilemma) and that those who already hold a strong position in the community will gain even more (Matthew effect) (Michels, 2011; Van Dooren & Thijssen, 2015; Weinberger & Jutting, 2001).

However, whether co-production actually resolves any of the 'wicked' problems of our current society and if that connection with democratic quality is justifiable, as often discussed by news outlets (Jawando, 2015; Teasdale, 2008; Vermeij, 2015) remains unstudied. More specifically in the field of community development, where the co-production effort focuses on derelict neighbourhoods and hard-to-reach populations, there is little to no research on democratic quality. And yet, this is exactly where factors of democratic quality, such as inclusion, empowerment and equity, need to be attained. That is why, in this case study we will turn to the co-production in community development and study their democratic quality.

Our previous literature review (Vanleene, Verschuere B., & Voets, 2015) identified three important variables, essential elements for co-production as well as possible influences of democratic quality. In this case study, we consequently want to know, firstly, how the co-production case is constructed and to what extent the elements of co-production are present, or to what extent we can actually talk of co-production:

- a. Professional support: How able is the employee to 'enable' and to 'ask'?
- b. Competence: How much access do the residents have to resources and knowledge?
- c. Salience: How significant is the project for the co-producer and his/her family and friends? How long does the project take? What impact does it have on their daily lives?

Secondly, there is the concept 'democratic quality' which most commonly consisted of one of three aspects: inclusion, empowerment and equity. In this study we shall research the degree of democratic quality by answering the following questions:

- a. Are the citizens who are affected by the co-production project included?
- b. Do the co-producers have or perceive an actual influence on the outcomes?
- c. Are the co-producers equally free of risks and do they have equal access to the benefits

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Before diving into the methodology of this case study, we need to clarify the main concepts derived from literature and the subsequent research questions. In the following chapter we succinctly shall discuss the definition of co-production and some significant elements that are required for co-production to exist. Following this summation the concept ‘democratic quality’ will be outlined, as well as the different translations as described in the state of the art. For a more extensive literature review we can direct you to the 2015 EGPA conference paper “The democratic quality of coproduction: a theoretical review and initial research design.”

A. CO-PRODUCTION

For this case study, co-production will be defined as the comprehensive concept discussed by Brandsen and Honingh (2015). They based their new definition on three basic principles that need to be achieved:

- 1) There needs to be a relationship between the professionals of an organisation and individual citizens (or groups of them).
- 2) Citizens are required to directly and actively add to the work of the organisation.
- 3) The professionals are paid employees while citizens receive no financial compensation.

Next to these base elements, Brandsen and Honingh (2015) provided a variation within the concept. Firstly, the extent of citizen involvement, meaning whether citizens are solely involved in implementation, or also partake in the design of the services. And secondly, whether the citizens’ efforts are in the core process of the professional organisation, or not. By placing these elements into a table, they find four types of co-production:

	Implementation	Design and implementation
Complementary	Complementary co-production in implementation	Complementary co-production in service design and implementation
Non-complementary	Co-production in the implementation of core services	Co-production in the design and implementation of core services

TABLE 1 TYPOLOGY FROM BRANDSEN & HONINGH (2015)

In this pilot study, we will research the fourth type of co-production, *the relationship between (groups of) individual citizens and paid employees of a (public or non-profit) organisation that requires direct and active contribution from these citizens in the design and/or implementation of core services on a local level*. A further specification of the typology will follow once the case has been researched.

Three significant elements can be considered as requirements for co-production to exist. All three find their origins in our base definition. When we focus on the *‘relationship between (groups of) individual citizens and paid employees of a (public or non-profit) organisation’*, the necessity for professional support as well as competent citizens can be derived. The salience of the project could be considered a requirement to achieve that *‘direct and active contribution’*. As they are often considered significant variables in literature, the intensity of these elements within the case could also be a potential influence of the democratic quality of the project (Blakeley & Evans, 2009; de Graaf et al., 2015; Michels, 2015).

1. PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT

To clarify the concept further, we use the ideas of de Graaf et al. (2015) and Durose (2011) who divide the concept into (1) the employee’s ability to enable and (2) to ask. Firstly, ‘the employee’s ability to enable’ means that professionals attempt to make it easy for citizens to get involved by supplying the knowledge and resources needed for the specific co-production project (Jakobsen, 2013; Jakobsen & Andersen, 2013; Wagenaar, 2007). Secondly, ‘the employee’s ability to ask’. Here the professionals need to mobilise citizens via direct invitation, and not simply by providing the option without any further action on their part. More importantly, when working

in disadvantaged neighbourhoods, professionals need to go even further than an invite (Denters & Klok, 2010; Herian et al., 2012; Simmons & Birchall, 2005).

From previous research (de Graaf et al., 2015; Denters & Klok, 2010; Durose, 2011; Herian et al., 2012; Jakobsen, 2013; Jakobsen & Andersen, 2013; Simmons & Birchall, 2005; Wagenaar, 2007) we conclude that professional support can be considered as *the employee's ability to enable and ask*.

2. COMPETENCE

The second influence mentioned in literature (Denters & Klok, 2010; van Eijk & Steen, 2014; S. Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 2000) is competence, also distinguishable into two requirements: "access to information and its interpretations and use of the best available procedures for knowledge selection (Webler & Tuler, 2000, p. 571)". There is the need for resources and knowledge, as citizens who are considered less capable and thus easily excluded, need to have access to those resources and knowledge that will allow them to partake in the co-production project. Thus we consider competence as *the access to and understanding of resources and knowledge and self-confidence*.

3. SALIENCE

Our third, and last significant variable is salience. Literature (Blakeley & Evans, 2009; Denters & Klok, 2010; Fung, 2004; Simmons & Birchall, 2005) assumes that people who are happy with the situation or service will find it less important to participate than those who are unsatisfied. That they have an interest in the issue the project is trying to address, is one of the most important influences (de Graaf et al., 2015). In summation, the salience of the service can be seen as *the significance of the project for the co-producer, their family and friends, the length of said-project and its potential impact on their daily lives*.

B. DEMOCRATIC QUALITY

Citizen participation is often directly connected to the idea of democratic quality (Bakker, 2015). This view originated with Rousseau, who believed that the involvement of each citizen is vitally important for the state to function. Since then modern theorists have expanded on this theory, adding that this participation should stretch even further, into workplaces and local communities (Michels, 2011). Yet, as Young (2000) explains, democracies can be found in different degrees thus measuring differently when assessing their democratic quality.

Three essential aspects appear regularly when researching the literature and together shape an all-encompassing definition for democratic quality. These are inclusion, empowerment and equity and though they might appear under different names, e.g. fairness (Webler & Tuler, 2000), or no obvious name at all, their definitions imply similar concepts and thus collectively become democratic quality. Below the interpretations found in the state of the art, are described and combined to generate a definition for democratic quality.

1. INCLUSION

The first interpretation of democratic quality is 'inclusion', which refers to the possibility for everyone, minorities included, to participate. The legitimacy of participatory decision-making is thus dependent on the degree to which those affected by those decisions are included in the process (Young, 2000). Rousseau, but since then Robert Putnam as well argues that simply letting citizens participate already leads to more inclusion which in turn then leads to more democratic quality (Michels, 2011).

For the purposes of this research the different interpretations found in research (Agger & Larsen, 2009; Lombard, 2013; Michels, 2011; Young, 2000) are shaped into a definition befitting this study, where inclusion is *the opportunity for those who are affected by the co-production project to be included in the design and implementation phases*.

2. EMPOWERMENT

A second interpretation can be found in the concept 'empowerment', where the citizens are and feel empowered by the process, thus strengthening their sense of democratic quality in the project. Buckwalter (2014) defined empowerment as 'voice', referring to not just speaking, but also being heard and being understood. He states that citizen empowerment should be measurable in the outcomes of the project, as these outcomes should show the citizens' efforts.

Collecting different definitions in literature (Buckwalter, 2014; de Graaf et al., 2015; Halvorsen, 2003; Webler & Tuler, 2000), empowerment will be considered *the co-producers' perception of having an actual voice in the process and actual influence on the outcome*.

3. Equity

Thirdly, there is equity, which implies that the benefits of the project are evenly and fairly distributed (Cuthill, 2010; Jakobsen & Andersen, 2013). In literature (Fung, 2004; Herian et al., 2012; Webler & Tuler, 2000) equity is also often called fairness. The concept of fairness points to the notion that citizens need to be able to actively participate. Thus, ideally, fairness would mean getting equal opportunities, being equally free of risks and dangers and having equal access to benefits. Equity is thus defined *as being equally free of risks and dangers and having equal access to the resulting benefits of the project*.

4. DEMOCRATIC QUALITY

When collecting them, the three interpretations above can be considered requirements that need to be fulfilled to achieve full democratic quality, thus building one encompassing definition for the concept.

A revised definition on the democratic quality of co-production would then be *the extent to which the citizens who are affected by the co-production project are included, free of risks and have equal access to the resulting benefits of the project as well as an actual voice in the process and influence in the outcomes*.

III. METHODOLOGY

Following this conceptualisation & summation of definitions and an outline of the pilot case itself, the methodology for this case study can be discussed.

A. THE PILOT CASE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN 'T RABOT

The pilot case is the Rabot neighbourhood in Ghent, Belgium. Here frontline workers, both governmental and non-profit, team up with the residents in developing and implementing public services (Brandsen & Honingh, 2015). Across the neighbourhood different projects can be found, organised by the city as well as non-profits, all aimed at reversing neighbourhood decline, counteracting crime rates and/or social exclusion and increasing liveability. In this pilot study two subcases are selected. The first subcase, The Site, is one of the first projects in the neighbourhood and considered a success story, often portrayed as a best practice example in Europe. The second subcase, The Farmstead, is a smaller and newer project, that was initiated by the residents themselves.

SUBCASE: THE SITE

In 2007, the Site was created by a group of non-profits who realised they weren't getting anywhere using the typical citizen participation method. Listening to the citizens, and considering their background, a majority of Turkish residents originate from a farming region in Turkey, the non-profits decided on a green, sustainable project: the Site, a venue to test different methods on how to involve different groups in the various projects (Doc13; Int1). This temporary project is located on an old concrete factory floor, the former Alcatel site, and by now includes a 3000 m² city field, mini-gardens, a multipurpose sports field, a conservatory, storage containers

and a free shop. The project is temporary, as the lot is planned to be redeveloped into a new residential area the next few years. However, because of the success of the co-production project, the redevelopment plans now include a new space for city gardens and professionals are still in conversation for even more co-production possibilities (Int2; Int4).

In 2011 a new initiative was introduced in the neighbourhood, “Torekes”, a complementary currency that aims to attract citizens from minority groups to co-produce. The coin, Torekes, is not solely earned by neighbours who keep their street clean and/or put flowers on the windowsill. On the Site, co-producers can participate on workdays by helping to cleaning the streets and parks, weeding or planting on the city field and so on, in exchange for a mini compensation (2.5 euro/hour) with which they can then rent a city garden, or shop with at the local grocer (Doc23; Int1).

The target audience here are the residents living near the Site, but even more, those vulnerable groups often left out, such as people with a replacement income, children and young people from poor families, asylum seekers, single seniors or undocumented migrants (Doc4; Doc6). By working in the gardens co-producers get the opportunity to broaden their social networks and diversify. The Site aims to increase the new residents’ integration and break through their social isolation, as well as promote the empowerment of vulnerable groups (Doc22).

SUBCASE: THE FARMSTEAD

Until recently, the Farmstead was an inner area encircled by houses that held some 80 dilapidated garages. When the city bought the space to create a new public parking space and arrange for private gardens to be bought, they had not taken the opinion of the nearby residents into account. Some engaged citizens, who had seen what happened at the Site, decided there was more need for green space in their street as well, and assembled against the city’s proposal (Vervaet, 2016). Along with a Masters’ student in Architecture the citizens, naming themselves Farmsteaders, petitioned against the decision and started designing their ideal green space, even planting a symbolic tree in the middle of the planned parking space (Doc11; Doc17). Four months after their first uprising, the citizens achieved victory as the city repealed the planned parking space.

As spring 2016 arrived the Farmstead is being built into that green space for its residents. Under the guidance of Community Development Ghent, there are city gardens for the neighbours to rent, and a play and rest area and still more green to come (Doc11). As a means to rent the gardens, the complementary coin has been introduced here as well. And there are now workdays, organised by Community Development Ghent, on which that coin can be earned (Int3).

The Farmstead is an interesting subcase to compare the Site with. Not only is it younger, smaller and less known, but the main group of participants are middle class citizens, who experience and participate differently in the co-production effort. The need for professionals could be considered different, as these citizens had already achieved their main goal, to get a green space, the presence of professionals is thus less important compared to that of the Site (Int1). Both subcases have included the complementary currency, yet where citizens in the Site often participate because of the reward, the residents of the Farmstead were less enthused about the option, believing they do not need the compensation as much (Int3).

RESEARCH STRATEGY

In this study, three steps will be taken. First a document analysis will create a solid base that provides a first idea concerning the elements of co-production and its democratic quality. Secondly, expert interviews will answer uncertainties concerning the construction of the co-production project and will provide the professionals’ viewpoint on the second and third. Thus the elements of co-production will be depicted and the democratic quality explained. Lastly, not yet included in this paper, the citizen co-producers will be interviewed, this will

allow for their viewpoint to be present and direct the results. We assume that this combination of mixed methods, collecting diverse types of data, will best provides a solid and thorough answer to the research questions (Creswell, 2009). We address three research questions:

The variables used in the research are derived from a literature review (Vanleene et al., 2015) based on a combination of co-production and participation literature. Additionally we allow the option of other, as-of-yet unmentioned variables to appear during the study. Thus we follow a combination of semi-inductive research, analysing the data with an open mind, and semi-deductive research, having the theories and concepts ascertained in participation literature as a guide throughout the study.

Following the literature review, the concepts found therein first need to be operationalised. That operationalisation was derived from previous research, as well as discussions between researchers and professionals. This early operationalisation ensures a clear research method that can be replicated in future case studies.

DATA ANALYSIS

Once a research plan was made, several of the employees from the non-profit organisation 'Community Development Ghent' were invited to provide input concerning the research plan and ask their cooperation during the process. Based on their feedback the operationalised questions were honed and added to. Subsequently we began a document analysis. Through the contacts already made, we collected and analysed official documents (26%), webpages (45%), magazine (17%) and newspaper articles (2%), research papers (6%) and theses (2%) to create a thoroughly researched basis for the case. Informal meetings with employees allowed us to enlarge our data, and offered background information when necessary. These informal meetings also led to a first selection of expert interviews. The documents were uploaded onto Nvivo, a qualitative data analysis program, and with the use of a data tree as well as inductively some rudimentary links to the research questions could be made. (see Annex 3 for the data tree)

Following this first data collection, the document analysis is supplemented with in-depth interviews with employees of the co-producing organisations. Two field workers who work, as well as two administrators were selected in this case study. As Creswell (2009) explains, for qualitative research such as in-depth interviews it is important to purposefully select those individuals that will best help the researcher in understanding the issues, and answer the research questions. These interviews aim to provide specific information and the professional's perspective on the implementation and goals of the co-production project that the document analysis could not provide (Yin, 2009). Each interview was done separately and took at least one hour. Because of the busy schedules, particularly of the over-asked field workers, the interviews prolonged this second phase with a month.

The interviews were transcribed and again uploaded onto Nvivo and coded. We use the same program and the same manner of working as in the document analysis in order to ensure a thorough and transparent analysis process. Here too, the combination of inductive work as well as the use of concepts offered by literature, aided in answering the research questions.

In the last step of the case study, not yet included in this paper, these in-depth interviews will be followed up by standardised interviews with groups of citizens, in order to gain the citizens' point of view.

IV. RESULTS

A. ELEMENTS OF CO-PRODUCTION

1. PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT

THE SITE

Derived from the Community Development Ghent website, and supported by the expert interviews, we found that professional support in The Site is mainly provided by three field workers of Community Development Ghent who take the lead and guide the residents in co-production. They are aided by colleagues, a policy worker and people in a work program and supported by employees of Ghent, such as a district director and a project leader (Int2; Int3).

By way of a covenant with the City of Ghent these professionals of Community Development Ghent are funded to maintain The Site and other projects in the neighbourhood (Int3; Int4). The City's financial investment can be found on their website, and is a collaboration of European, Flemish, Provincial and their own resources (Doc41). However, mentioned in all interviews, the funding has been diminishing, due to crisis and inflation, and the impact can be seen and felt in both organisations. Though this was not always said in such definite words, the professionals' struggles with a lack of time, abilities and personnel highlighted the shortage (Int1; Int3; Int4).

Through the covenant, the professionals are given autonomy in their decision-making, and seem to agree that they are partners rather than subordinates to the city (Int2; Int3; Int4). They are also the creators of the project and from these expert interviews, as well as the articles written in their magazine FRANK (Doc22- Doc27), it is clear how passionate these individuals are about their work and impact.

When considering the professional's ability to 'enable' and 'ask', these professionals put one step before that: According to employees of Community Development Ghent, in order to achieve a successful co-production project, the professional needs to be there to listen to the residents. This means they are physically present in the neighbourhood, thus allowing easy access to their person as well as apprehending and witnessing the neighbourhood's issues, the citizens needs and characteristics (Int1; Int2):

"We call that presence politics. That's actually in the street, ensuring that you are away from that desk, talking on the streets and with the people and getting started with those people." (Int1)

Subsequently, from the information gathered through this 'presence politics' the professional has three more roles that fall under enabling and/or asking. Firstly, in order to acquire the right tools and resources to enable, they need to represent the neighbourhood and its residents to the outside world. This is even more important in community development projects, with citizens who dare not or cannot stand up for themselves (Int1; Int3; Int4).

"a property that is released or land released and it's our role basically to ask our colleagues from the city or politicians and say look man this is our shot, there actually is a problem or there is an opportunity, can we do something about it?" (Int4)

Similarly, when trying to enable, the professionals facilitate and respond to the citizens' needs and demands. At The Site, for example, this means that the professionals buy seeds or sports equipment in bulk when asked by the co-producers thus allowing the citizens to buy desired items with their complementary currency at a lower rate (Int2). When enthusiastic residents came with the idea of a 'free shop', and asked for a space to start in, the professionals did not hesitate to offer the use of one of The Site's containers (Int1). This facilitating was mentioned by the field workers but also by the district director, and was clearly considered evident to achieve successful co-production and more specifically, to encourage citizen empowerment (Int1; Int2; Int4).

Lastly, an aspect that seems particular to this case is the professional's ability to lead. This concept arose in the interview with a field worker, one of the original creators of the Site (Int1). He explained that once they have become attuned to the citizens' needs, they need to address the issues they see. This could be a significant argument in neighbourhoods with hard-to-reach populations as these citizens are more often unsure, unaware or unmotivated to discover their own abilities, the possibilities and tools in their neighbourhood. In the other interviews this viewpoint was reiterated (Int1; Int2; Int3; Int4), though none could explain why these citizens are less inclined to fight for their own ideas and opportunities. However, the citizens' enthusiasm to co-produce once the project is established, demonstrates the need for a professional to lead the charge:

"People think you have to let everything rise bottom-up, but you have to dare to stimulate it as well." (Int1)

THE FARMSTEAD

When discussing the Farmstead in the interviews, we found the answers were very different, if not more ambiguous. This initiative is young still, initiated in 2014, and has only recently grown into an actual co-production project: in 2015 the city gardens were constructed and in 2016 the workdays have begun (Doc45; Doc46). The Farmstead originally was funded by the Ghent's citizen initiative budget (Doc17) and just acquired the support of Community Development Ghent. Because of its difficult history with the city, the citizens' relationship with professionals may not be as clearly established and/or trusted as in The Site (Doc17).

In the expert interviews, the professionals admitted that because this project originated from the citizens themselves, the dynamic between the two is different. Whereas The Site came from professionals who drew the citizens in, in the Farmstead citizens expect to be considered partners (Int1; Int3). It could be that because of this, the professionals consider them 'difficult to handle', with louder voices, and more knowledgeable about their options (Int1; Int2; Int4). Here the professionals attempt to provide support similar to that in The Site, yet on a much smaller scale. As the project is still so young, there are less examples of their tactics in this project. Though, several interviews mentioned the necessity for professional support when focussing on the ability to 'ask', more specifically their effort to represent and include those neighbours who have less 'voice', are less aware or even unaware of the co-production project in their neighbourhood was highlighted (Int1; Int2). Both field workers explained here how the citizens had enthusiastically decided they would contact neighbours to ask their opinion on the contents of this co-production project. However, by ringing the doorbell of nearby houses, those who were not home, or could not speak the language were left out. Thus Community Development Ghent stepped up and arranged specific gatherings to invite all who were interested to participate (Int1; Int2).

"They had already done a door to door survey on what should come on the Farmstead, and well people who speak Turkish: sorry we don't speak Turkish, and they'd go to the next door. And we said, wow, not so fast, we're going to arrange three moments, for people who might not open the door when you call, or who weren't home, or can't understand you." (Int2)

Lastly, in this project, a fourth role for the professional appears: the professionals see themselves as mediators both between the city officials and the citizens, as well as between citizens themselves. Firstly, as the district director explained, the 'farmsteaders' needed a mediator to aid them in the creation of the project and their struggles with a hesitant city, someone who could appeal for their cause with an objective viewpoint (Int4):

"We have to be loyal to both sides, both to the neighbourhood and to politics, so we went behind the scenes and did some lobbying." (Int4)

Secondly, as these are strong voiced middle class citizens, reiterated in every interview, there was the need for an outsider to assist, guide and mediate between the neighbours to avoid friction. Here the field workers of Community Development Ghent took on that role (Int1, Int2):

"While I, I can get angry once in a while, if that doesn't make me popular, that's not so bad, I do not have to live next to them, and they need to be able to, so sometimes it is good that an outsider is present, I think." (Int2)

2. COMPETENCE

THE SITE

When discussing the citizens' competence, two different types of access can be derived from the interviews.

Firstly, the physical access, meaning the ease with which one can get involved and can find out about and get to the project. At the Site residents seem to have no problem with physical access (Int2; Int3). In fact, as the field workers explained, the threshold to participate has been made so low, by having no requirements, no physical boundaries and rewarding co-producers with complementary coin, not only residents but people from everywhere find their way to the Site:

"Also, many homeless that belong to the neighbourhood, or not, I don't know, but they come here for their favourite café or favourite spot here, or their network of people is here and they participate. But also, people who arrived last week, straight from Bulgaria, who actually know nothing, they come here." (Int2)

Secondly, there is the psychological access, the knowledge and abilities of the citizens needed to participate. Though interviewees agree that citizens find their way, and are able to participate, using the tools offered by the organisation, the answers concerning their understanding of the aim of the project, are incongruent. That the Site is a tool to approach the residents and build the community, two interviewees believe is not understood (Int2; Int4). However what the cause behind this lack of competence would be, neither can explain. And yet, an example of citizens who do understand is given by the policy advisor:

"People, these Turkish men, who use our jargon, not just using but understanding it, and tell me, I think, what we're doing here, is experimenting, we're a laboratory so that it can be executed in other districts." (Int3)

Whether these citizen co-producers can be considered competent, is still up in the air. Perhaps they are, yet less aware of their own abilities. But they are definitely aware of the Site and what it offers. And then the question is, what is most important, the physical access or the psychological? At least according to one interviewee, it is the first:

"What matters is the fact that these people are changing things in public space, whether they do or do not understand that in the terms that we formulate, that is unnecessary." (Int1)

THE FARMSTEAD

In the case of the Farmstead we find opposite results. Wherein The Site was well known and easy to access, the Farmstead is not. This may be due to its youth (Doc46), but also, as one interviewee suggested, because the Farmstead is an inner area, where only the neighbours who look out over it, or live near its entrance know of its existence (Int1).

Meanwhile, psychological access is different as well, as this citizen group is more assertive and has already established the project on their own, they can thus also be seen as more competent: they stick up for themselves and are quick in contacting official lines and politicians (Doc17; Int3; Int4). However, whether this psychological access is a general concept, or solely applies to those first 'farmsteaders' who fought for the project, is not clear.

3. SALIENCE

THE SITE

The easy access of the Site is directly linked with its salience for co-producers. Firstly, in all the interviews, the complementary currency, that is offered in exchange for co-production, was mentioned as one of the main points of interest for these citizens to co-produce. Because this is an "arrival district", many residents never acquire the

need to build community. The district director (Int4) believes the complementary currency, The Site and the professional support there are considered by the co-producers as more important and even vital for their future.

“The share of people who sit at home and get a basic income, if you can call it that, that’s very big and we see, with a little incentive, Torekes, that people do come out of their house and want to do something. Maybe it’s for the money, and perhaps less for the neighbourhood itself. But I think that for an audience who doesn’t know where they’re going to live next year, or within two years, that’s not that unusual really.” (Int4)

The currency can have a huge impact on the citizens’ personal life in other ways, as was made clear in the conversation with one of the field workers (Int2): for example when their income goes to paying the rent, this incentive allows them to put food on the table, refugees or illegal citizens can work here in safety rather than being mistreated on the undeclared labour circuit and medicine from the local apothecary can be bought with Torekes which in winter time can make the difference. But the currency along with the space, can also be considered significant for their family, a safe place where the children can play while parents work:

“Yeah, there’s nothing administrative, they come here and they can rotate. Yes, you can also choose with whom. People do that very often in families for example. Children who do not attend school at the time or are looking for a school and they are here together with mom and dad. Children play while mom and dad garden, that does not exist in many other places.” (Int2)

THE FARMSTEAD

In the Farmstead the salience can also easily be found: the project is a citizen initiative and the residents’ dedication to attain their goal, could be considered proof of its significance. Proof that they attach more importance to a green space, and thus the co-production project, instead of a parking space provided by the city (Doc17).

However, as the district director (Int4) explains, this salience is easy to understand and the direct opposite of that of the co-producers at the Site: The residents near the Farmstead, middle class citizens, are planning to live in that neighbourhood for a lengthier time, thus the neighbourhood and its development is significant for them, their friends and their children:

“we see that these middle class citizens, who’re saying: yes I live in this neighbourhood, I will probably continue to live here, twenty years or more and my children go to school here.... They are willing to invest in the area.” (Int4)

4. CONCLUSION

We can conclude on the elements of co-production in this pilot case with the following:

- We found that the professional support is high in both subcases. However, the presence of professionals at the Site is experienced as more significant for the co-production case to continue. Furthermore, there appears to be a shortage of funds that could influence the co-production case’s success in the future.
- The competence levels are moderate in both subcases, yet different in content. Where the physical access to the Site is high, the citizens’ understanding of knowledge and resources available to them would seem lower. At the Farmstead this is opposite, the project is less known and thus it is less easy to get involved. Those participants involved, however, do understand what is available to them.
- Lastly, the salience of these projects is high both times. Here the impact on their daily lives as well as the significance for their family and friends is apparent from the expert interviews and the success of the cases themselves.

B. THE DEGREE OF DEMOCRATIC QUALITY

Now that the elements of co-production have been discussed, we can turn to the second question: the degree of democratic quality. We do this along the lines of the three concepts defined earlier: inclusion, empowerment and equity.

1. INCLUSION

THE SITE

Concerning the degree of inclusion two conclusions can be made. In the document analysis demographics made it appear that the project the Site was highly inclusive (Doc30): From the +/-8334 residents in the neighbourhood (Doc30), about 300-350 people participated at The Site last year(Int2). However, several remarks need to be added here. First of all, as explained by employees in advance of the study and reiterated in the interviews (Int2; Int3; Int4) Rabot is known as an arrival district, which means there's a general rotation of 10% of the residents every year. Secondly, not only the residents of the neighbourhood are participating. The complementary currency also attracted more specific segments of vulnerable groups such as the homeless and asylum seekers... Thus, the numbers cannot give a clear idea of the inclusion of neighbourhood resident-co-producers.

However, as found in official documents on the projects (Doc1; Doc4; Doc5; Doc6; Doc8), the main target audience here are the citizens often left behind, the vulnerable groups: people with a replacement income, children from poor families, new people, single seniors, refugees, undocumented migrants.... From the expert interviews and previous research, it would seem this project reached its target audience:

"The Torekes project succeeded in other words, to broaden and deepen the existing diversity. This diversity encompasses several dimensions: age, immigration status, gender, religion, language, country of origin ..." (Doc16).

However, during the professional interviews it was remarked that as the Site became known amidst these vulnerable groups, the amount of participants exceeded the project, and the field workers' abilities. A decision was made to, temporarily, exclude those participants who did not own a city garden on the Site, while professionals looked for new jobs and options for the surplus.

"...we just succeeded to attract the lower layer of the population to get in the dynamics of the neighbourhood but then crashed against our own limits." (Int1)

For now, we conclude that the Site has a high degree of inclusion, but with a possible future decline due to limited resources.

THE FARMSTEAD

Because the farmstead is so recent, no demographics on the co-producers can be found yet. However, from the interviews with the field workers, we derive that the degree of inclusion is still low, as it originated from a homogenous group of neighbours. The professionals are still working on including those lower class citizens who are still unaware of the project, so inclusion might be rising in the future:

"And we said, wow, not so fast, we're going to arrange three moments, for people who might not open the door when you call, or who weren't home, or can't understand you." (Int2)

However, as one field worker(Int1) said, the Site focuses on a neighbourhood, while the Farmstead is an area focus on the nearby residents. A difference in inclusion between the two is not illogical.

2. EMPOWERMENT

When studying the citizens' empowerment two types could be found, which we will call 'dialogue' and 'initiative' in this paper.

THE SITE

In the Site we mainly find empowerment in the shape of 'dialogue', which aids in the citizens' perceptions of having an actual voice and influence by creating the opportunities for citizens to approach professionals, to be informed of and participate in the design of the projects. The field workers and policy advisor of community development Ghent, who stand nearest to these citizens, have several examples of instances where citizens could suggest changes to the design by approaching the field workers as well as other professionals. For example when citizens noticed the need for a pharmacy to join in the complementary currency exchange system, they went to ask the owner themselves:

"...the addition of a pharmacist really came purely on demand from residents who said, look I know them well, I'm going to ask." (Int2)

This dialogue goes two ways, as the professionals empower the citizens as well by asking their input. For example, the professionals arranged gatherings to ask citizens for their input in writing a report that connects theory with practice on neighbourhood management (Int3), or asked a group of Turkish women to help design the look and contents of the local social restaurant:

"That group, for example, has been involved in the start-up of café Toreke you know. So you start from something they like to do and link them to context that's interesting for them. So, these women sat in the working groups on the café, what it should look like, what has to be prepared, they even, through the sewing workshop they were part of, participated in crafting the interior." (Int1)

THE FARMSTEAD

When discussing the Farmstead we found a second type of empowerment, 'initiative'. Here the empowerment is already present even before the co-production effort begins. As the district director explained, here (a group of) citizens see the Site and the dynamic it creates in the neighbourhood and decide that they want something similar in their neighbourhood. The Farmstead is the first example of this, but by now other areas and resident groups have learned from this co-production project (e.g. Maria Goretti Church...):

"for the inner area, residents say look at the Site, it works well and actually we want something like that ... So yeah, the Site has really inspired. And now it branches out." (Int4)

We can thus conclude that in both of these subcases, according to professionals, citizens have a voice in the process and can influence the outcome, thus the level of empowerment could be considered high.

3. EQUITY

Lastly, there is equity, where citizens are equally free of risks and dangers and have equal access to the resulting benefits of the project. Here results show no difference when discussing the participants of the Site or those of the Farmstead.

In this pilot study, when considering equity or fairness, it became clear that though citizens receive identical benefits, the access to those benefits is not identical, but adaptable to one's specific needs. However, when considering equity thus, a darker side to the term appears.

Firstly, the field workers explain (Int1; Int2) by attaining personal relationships with the co-producers, they aim to understand their needs and abilities and adjust the coproducing effort to their person, thus achieving equal access to the benefits of the project, regardless of one's abilities or knowledge:

"It's searching, who can be placed where and how can you meet their aspirations or what they like to do. That's the balancing act." (Int1)

From this one could conclude that thanks to the complementary currency, both the Site and the Farmstead have a high level of equity, as all co-producers receive the same rewards and opportunities and are granted equal access to the resulting benefits of the projects:

“There is no distinction between what people do to be appreciated for it with Torekes. So you have the volunteer who is very good with a computer, who’ll get as much or as little as someone who rakes outside. ... That makes it actually very fair.” (Int3)

However, as each of the professionals mentioned, this can also be experienced as an issue by co-producers. After all, those citizens who are working less during the workday, who take cigarette breaks or have less energy, are awarded equally as those who work hard, or are even awarded more than those who work on the days that no complementary coin can be earned (Int1; Int2; Int3; Int4):

“On the Farmstead people’d say yes but, I’m here every day weeding, so to speak, and then on the workday I happen to have to go to work, and that’s when Torekes can be earned. That’s not envy, but we’re trying to find a way to make the work actionable” (Int4)

Whether this side to equity influences the citizen’s perceptions on fairness remains the question.

4. DEMOCRATIC QUALITY

We thus conclude that the democratic quality of this co-production case is moderate to high.

- The inclusion of citizens is different in each subcase. Where the inclusion rate was high and is possibly declining at The Site, the inclusion of residents in the Farmstead is low, with the possibility of it rising steadily.
- On the empowerment of the co-producers we found that both subcases have high empowerment, yet different types of empowerment. Where the citizens in the Site are empowered through the professional support and dialogue, the citizens at the Farmstead were already empowered before the arrival of professionals, and continue to be more autonomous.
- Lastly, on equity, we find that because of the complementary currency, both subcases have a similar benefits and can thus be considered high on equity. However one needs to keep in mind the darker side of equity, and therefor the potential sense of unfairness from the citizens’ perspective.

V. DISCUSSION

THE CO-PRODUCTION ELEMENTS

The elements of co-production as found in literature were all mentioned in this case study, and were clearly considered important aspects for the success of the co-production project by the professionals. Whether a link can be established between these variables and the democratic quality is yet to be tested further. However, in interviews we find that the professionals themselves impart a high importance to their ability to support, enable and ask the citizen co-producers and find they are directly and indirectly dedicated to achieve inclusion, empowerment and equity.

However, from the comparison between these two subcases, we can see that the requirements for this professional support might differ depending on the co-producers. Where the citizens of the Site seem to require a professional who can represent, facilitate and respond and lead, the 'farmsteaders' have more need for a mediator. This is an important difference to take into account when considering the democratic quality of the projects.

Secondly, where it is easy for citizens to get access to the Site in comparison to the Farmstead, the psychological access, having the knowledge and comprehending, is considerably lower at the Site than in the Farmstead. Yet, this does not seem to hinder the Site's success. It could be that the increase in professional support here, makes up for that supposed lack of competence. Thus the importance of these factors in comparison to one another becomes a factor to study in future research.

Lastly, the salience of both subcases is high, according to the professionals. As community development projects are aimed at impacting the daily lives of the citizens and changing their direct community, this would be a sign to the project's success in achieving its goals.

THE DEMOCRATIC QUALITY OF THE CO-PRODUCTION CASE

In view of the high level of democratic quality in this case, a few conclusions can be made.

In this case study we find indicators that agree with the idea, originated with Rousseau, that simply letting citizens participate leads to more inclusion (Michels, 2011). More specifically, by comparing the two subcases a first link can be made between professional support and inclusion. After all, where professional support is discussed, it is considered a necessity in both subcases to achieve the inclusion of all who can be or are affected by the co-production project. The differences in inclusion between the subcases already indicate that professional support could be an important factor. The issue at The Site, where they now need to limit the amount of co-producers because they have exceeded their abilities, indicates this necessity for professional support as well. From this we could hypothesize that professional support, meaning being present, facilitating and responding, mediating and leading, leads to higher inclusion when working with vulnerable groups in co-production projects.

Secondly, for the first subcase The Site, professional support was also a requirement to achieve the empowerment of the citizen co-producers in that case. This need for professionals to, among other things, inform and make citizens aware of their influence (i.e. empowering them) has been argued in previous research as well (Buckwalter, 2014; de Graaf et al., 2015). However, at the Farmstead, this professional support was deemed unnecessary, as the citizens were already taking initiative before Community Development Ghent's arrival. Here, the characteristics of the citizens (middle class vs. minority group) as well as the origins of the co-production project (initiated by citizens or an organisation) could be a reason for citizen empowerment and whether or not professional support needs to be encouraging it.

Thirdly, we find that in our case, as stated by Herian et al. (2012) and Webler and Tuler (2000), the organisation's transparency and trustworthiness could influence the citizens' involvement, more specifically if they feel able to express their viewpoint and influence decisions, they will experience a sense of fairness. Thus professional

support might also be linked with equity, though the data on this subject is yet too scarce to produce a solid conclusion. However, an important remark find in this study is that there is another side to the organisation's aims to achieve a high level of equity, wherein everyone receives the same benefits. It would seem that this high level of equity could potentially create a sense of unfairness from certain citizens' perspectives; indicating a darker side when working towards the democratic quality of co-production. This however, will need to be studied in future research.

METHODOLOGY

Thus we arrive at the methodology of this case. This pilot case, though achieving results, still shows certain shortages in the operationalisation of the concepts. Through the interviews the researchers discovered a depth within the concept of professional support, and a potential typology in empowerment. These concepts need to be further researched and developed in future research, as this could be a significant factor to explain the (lack of) democratic quality in a case.

Secondly, though the document analysis and expert interviews offer a good idea of the democratic quality in this case, the citizen's point of view still lacks. Thus, in order to achieve a robust result, the next step in this research will be to interview the citizen participants of the case. As these citizens are often hard-to-reach, illiterate, non-native speakers, or fearful of governmental organisations, we will be guiding them through each question, with translators present to aid them in the process.

In future research, similar case studies can be done, following the design of an international comparative case study, with a multiple-case replication design as presented by Yin (2009). The findings resulting from this comparative study become more compelling for all co-production cases in community development.

Yin (2009) explains that the logic of replication will allow for a selection of cases based on previous findings, each case thus ensuring it will be, either a literal replication, i.e. predicting similar results, or a theoretical replication, predicting contrasts that could be foreseen (Yin, 2009). This means that when selecting a case that lacks one specific variable (e.g. professional support) when that variable has appeared essential for democratic quality in a previous case, the results could ensure a convincing argument. However, because this is semi-inductive research, more and other categories could still emerge as the data is systematically processed into codes (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Webler & Tuler, 2000). By assembling these different cases and data, we aim to find the connection and variables that link the elements of co-production, or other variables, to the information gathered on democratic quality, explaining what influences the democratic quality of a co-production project.

VI. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agger, A., & Larsen, J. N. (2009). Exclusion in Area-based Urban Policy Programmes. *European Planning Studies*, 17(7), 1085-1099. doi:10.1080/09654310902949646
- Alford, J. (2002). Why do public-sector clients coproduce? Toward a contingency theory. *Administration & Society*, 34(1), 32-56. doi:10.1177/0095399702034001004
- Bakker, H. (2015). Burgerinitiatieven kunnen niet zonder de representatieve democratie. *Sociale vraagstukken.nl*.
- Blakeley, G., & Evans, B. (2009). Who Participates, How and Why in Urban Regeneration Projects? The Case of the New 'City' of East Manchester. *Social Policy & Administration*, 43(1), 15-32. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9515.2008.00643.x
- Brandsen, T., & Helderma, J.-K. (2012). The Trade-Off Between Capital and Community: The Conditions for Successful Co-production in Housing. *Voluntas*, 23(4), 1139-1155. doi:10.1007/s11266-012-9310-0
- Brandsen, T., & Honingh, M. (2015). Distinguishing Different Types of Coproduction: A Conceptual Analysis Based on the Classical Definitions. *Public Administration Review*, n/a-n/a. doi:10.1111/puar.12465
- Brandsen, T., Trommel, W., & Verschuere, B. (2014). *Manufactured Civil Society: Practices, Principles and Effects*. London: Palgrave.
- Buckwalter, N. D. (2014). The Potential for Public Empowerment through Government-Organized Participation. *Public Administration Review*, 74(5), 573-584. doi:10.1111/puar.12217
- Butler, P. (2015). Why the 'big society' is now just a hashtag for coalition hypocrisy. *The Guardian*.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*: SAGE Publications.
- Cuthill, M. (2010). Strengthening the 'Social' in Sustainable Development: Developing a Conceptual Framework for Social Sustainability in a Rapid Urban Growth Region in Australia. *Sustainable Development*, 18(6), 362-373. doi:10.1002/sd.397
- de Boer, N. (2013). Doe-democratie, de kabinetsnota valt niet tegen. *Sociale vraagstukken.nl*.
- de Graaf, L., van Hulst, M., & Michels, A. (2015). Enhancing Participation in Disadvantaged Urban Neighbourhoods. *Local Government Studies*, 41(1), 44-62. doi:10.1080/03003930.2014.908771
- Denters, B., & Klok, P.-J. (2010). Rebuilding Roombeek: Patterns of Citizen Participation in Urban Governance. *Urban Affairs Review*, 45(5), 583-607. doi:10.1177/1078087409356756
- Durose, C. (2011). Revisiting Lipsky: Front-Line Work in UK Local Governance. *Political Studies*, 59(4), 978-995. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9248.2011.00886.x
- Fledderus, J. (2016). *User co-production of public service delivery: effects on trust. (doctoral dissertation)*. University of Nijmegen, Nijmegen, The Netherlands.
- Fung, A. (2004). *Empowered Participation: Reinventing Urban Democracy*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Halvorsen, K. E. (2003). Assessing the effects of public participation. *Public Administration Review*, 63(5), 535-543. doi:10.1111/1540-6210.00317
- Herian, M. N., Hamm, J. A., Tomkins, A. J., & Zillig, L. M. P. (2012). Public Participation, Procedural Fairness, and Evaluations of Local Governance: The Moderating Role of Uncertainty. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(4), 815-840. doi:10.1093/jopart/mur064
- Jakobsen, M. (2013). Can Government Initiatives Increase Citizen Coproduction? Results of a Randomized Field Experiment. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 23(1), 27-54. doi:10.1093/jopart/mus036
- Jakobsen, M., & Andersen, S. C. (2013). Coproduction and Equity in Public Service Delivery. *Public Administration Review*, 73(5), 704-713. doi:10.1111/puar.12094
- Jawando, M. (2015). Citizens United at Five: Money undermines Meaningful Participation. *Huffington Post*.
- Lombard, M. (2013). Citizen Participation in Urban Governance in the Context of Democratization: Evidence from Low-Income Neighbourhoods in Mexico. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(1), 135-150. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2012.01175.x
- Michels, A. (2011). Innovations in democratic governance: how does citizen participation contribute to a better democracy? *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 77(2), 275-293. doi:10.1177/0020852311399851
- Michels, A. (2015). Hoe we uit het ideologische doe-democratie-debat kunnen komen. *Samenlevingsvraagstukken.nl*.
- Ministerie van BZK. (2013). *Kabinetsnota Doe-democratie*.
- Ostrom, E. (1996). Crossing the great divide: Coproduction, synergy, and development. *World Development*, 24(6), 1073-1087. doi:10.1016/0305-750x(96)00023-x

- Parks, R. B., P. Baker, L. Kiser, R. J. Oakerson, E. Ostrom, V. Ostrom, . . . Wilson, a. R. (1981). Consumers as Co-producers of Public Services: Some Economic and Institutional Considerations. *Policy Studies Journal*, 9(7), 1001-1011.
- Pestoff, V. (2012). Co-production and Third Sector Social Services in Europe: Some Concepts and Evidence. *Voluntas*, 23(4), 1102-1118. doi:10.1007/s11266-012-9308-7
- Putnam, R. D. (2001). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*: Simon & Schuster.
- Simmons, R., & Birchall, J. (2005). A joined-up approach to user participation in public services: Strengthening the "participation chain". *Social Policy & Administration*, 39(3), 260-283. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9515.2005.00439.x
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques*: Sage Publications.
- Teasdale, S. (2008). Reaching out to volunteers. *The Guardian*.
- Van Dooren, W., & Thijssen, P. (2015). Who you are / where you live. Do neighbourhood characteristics explain coproduction. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 81(2).
- van Eijk, C., & Steen, T. (2014). Why People Co-Produce: Analysing citizens' perceptions on co-planning engagement in health care services. *Public Management Review*, 16(3), 358-382. doi:10.1080/14719037.2013.841458
- Vanleene, D., Verschuere B., & Voets, J. (2015). *The democratic quality of coproduction: a theoretical review and initial research design* (2015). Paper presented at the EGPA Conference, Toulouse, France.
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*: Harvard University Press.
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (2000). Rational action and political activity. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 12(3), 243-268. doi:10.1177/0951692800012003001
- Vermeij, L. K., Jeanet. (2015). Wordt de stad een exclusief feestje voor kansrijke stedelingen? *Sociale vraagstukken.nl*.
- Verschuere, B., Brandsen, T., & Pestoff, V. (2012). Co-production: The State of the Art in Research and the Future Agenda. *Voluntas*, 23(4), 1083-1101. doi:10.1007/s11266-012-9307-8
- Voorberg, W. H., Bekkers, V. J. J. M., & Tummers, L. G. (2014). A Systematic Review of Co-Creation and Co-Production: Embarking on the social innovation journey. *Public Management Review*, 1-25. doi:10.1080/14719037.2014.930505
- Wagenaar, H. (2007). Governance, complexity, and democratic participation - How citizens and public officials harness the complexities of neighborhood decline. *American Review of Public Administration*, 37(1), 17-50. doi:10.1177/0275074006296208
- Watt, N. (2010). David Cameron reveals 'Big Society' vision - and denies it is just cost cutting. *The Guardian*.
- Webler, T., & Tuler, S. (2000). Fairness and competence in citizen participation - Theoretical reflections from a case study. *Administration & Society*, 32(5), 566-595. doi:10.1177/00953990022019588
- Weinberger, K., & Jutting, J. P. (2001). Women's participation in local organizations: Conditions and constraints. *World Development*, 29(8), 1391-1404. doi:10.1016/s0305-750x(01)00049-3
- Yin, R. (2009). *Case Study Research: design and methods*: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Young, I. (2000). *Inclusion and Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

VII. ANNEX

ANNEX 1: OPERATIONALISED RESEARCH QUESTIONS

DOCUMENT
ANALYSIS

IN-DEPTH
EMPLOYEE
INTERVIEWS

STRUCTURED CITIZEN INTERVIEWS

Q1. HOW IS THE CO-PRODUCTION CASE CONSTRUCTED?

WHO ARE THE PAID EMPLOYEES OF THE (PUBLIC OR NON-PROFIT) ORGANISATION?

Organisation(s) involved
Number of employees related to the case
Job description related to the case
Structure of professionals/organigram

WHO ARE THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE CASE?

Number of co-producers
Gender of co-producers
Age of co-producers
Education of co-producers
Occupation of co-producers
Language at home/birthplace of parents
Level of experience within project
Intended target audience

WHAT IS THE 'WICKED' PROBLEM OF THE CO-PRODUCTION CASE WANTS TO RESOLVE?

Mission statement
Wicked Problem

WHAT DOES THE CO-PRODUCTION ENTAIL?

Intended resolution/goal
Who decides/steers the case?
Citizens' roles
Professionals' roles
Conflicts handled
Relationship frontline workers-citizens

WHAT SERVICES/PRODUCTS ARE BEING CO-PRODUCED?

Direct services/products for co-producers
Indirect results from co-production

Q2. TO WHAT EXTENT ARE THE ELEMENTS OF CO-PRODUCTION PRESENT?

PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT

HOW INVESTED IS THE ORGANISATION?

Funding
Number of employees in the case
Time assigned to the case
Job content related to the case

HOW ABLE IS THE EMPLOYEE TO 'ENABLE'? HOW ABLE IS THE EMPLOYEE TO 'ASK'?

Personal goal-setting
Autonomous decision-making?
Issues encountered & Response

COMPETENCE

HOW MUCH ACCESS DO THE PARTICIPANTS TO THE RESOURCES AND KNOWLEDGE?

Language barrier
Knowing where to get it
Real distance
Actual comprehension

HOW SELF-CONFIDENT ARE THEY IN CO-PRODUCING?

Actually learning
Self-confidence

SALIENCE

HOW SIGNIFICANT IS THE PROJECT FOR THE CO-PRODUCER AND FAMILY AND FRIENDS?

	Importance of the co-produced service		
	Importance of reward system		
	Social network in neighbourhood (family/friends)		
	Renting vs. homeowner in neighbourhood		
	History in neighbourhood		
	Sense of responsibility		

WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON THEIR DAILY LIVES?

	Changes in health/happiness		
	Changes in lifestyle		
	Changes in social life		
	Visible changes in neighbourhood		

HOW LONG IS SAID PROJECT?

	Intended longevity of project		
	Durability of the product		

Q3. WHAT IS THE DEGREE OF DEMOCRATIC QUALITY IN THE CASE?

INCLUSION

ARE THE CITIZENS WHO ARE AFFECTED BY THE CO-PRODUCTION PROJECT INCLUDED? IS THERE ANY EXCLUSION BASED ON THE NEIGHBOURHOOD'S DEMOGRAPHIC?

	Comparison of demographics		
--	----------------------------	--	--

EMPOWERMENT

DO THE CO-PRODUCERS HAVE OR PERCEIVE AN ACTUAL INFLUENCE ON THE OUTCOMES?

	Opportunities for suggestions		
	Organisation's response to suggestions		

HOW AUTONOMOUS ARE THEY?

	Time it takes for suggestions to be implemented		
	Who steers the co-production?		
	Permission needed for initiative		

EQUITY

DO THEY EXPERIENCE FAIRNESS IN THE PROCESS OF THE PROJECT?

	Benefits experienced		
	Risks experienced		

ARE THEY SATISFIED WITH THE SERVICES?

	Recommendations to friends/families		
	Needs fulfilled		
	Overall quality		

DO THEY EXPERIENCE FAIRNESS IN THE OUTCOME OF THE PROJECT?

	Co-producer's vision of outcome/results of case		
	Comparison with others		

ANNEX 2: LIST OF DOCUMENTS

	Type	Author	Title	Year	Organisation	Magazine
Doc1	Official Document	Unassigned	Recht op wonen in een vernieuwde stad	n.d.	Stad Gent	
Doc2	Official Document	Unassigned	Wijkmonitor	n.d.	Stad Gent	
Doc3	Official Document	Programma Strategisch Fondsenbeheer en Interbestuurlijke Samenwerking	- Gent - Bruggen naar Rabot - JOC Rabot	2005	Stad Gent	
Doc4	Official Document	Dienst Stedenbeleid en Internationale betrekkingen	Samen werken aan je wijk Naar een programma voor Rabot-Blaisantvest	2007	Stad Gent	
Doc5	Official Document	Unassigned	Beleidsnota: communicatie, onthaal, beleidsparticipatie en stadsmarketing 2014-2019 (ontwerp)	2013	Stad Gent	
Doc6	Official Document	Unassigned	Van Ambitie tot Zuurstof	2015	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	
Doc8	Report	n.a.	BEWONERS INGESCHAKELD ALS DESKUNDIGEN: DE RESULTATEN	2006	Riso Gent	
Doc9	Report	n.a.	Dossier Boerenhof	2014	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	
Doc10	Report	n.a.	Mensen maken de buurt: Een opstap tot politiek burgerschap en stedelijke ontwikkeling	2015	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	
Doc11	Report	n.a.	Her aanleg van het boerenhof: take 3 actie!	2015	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	
Doc12	Report	n.a.	Projectvoorstel binnengebied Kwakkelstraat	n.d.	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	
Doc13	Report	n.a.	Visietekst De Site	n.d.	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	
Doc14	Research paper	Jans, Marc	Solidariteit in Superdiversiteit	2014	Diegem	
Doc15	Research paper	Oosterlynck, Stijn	Hoe geraken we voorbij de valse paradox tussen van onderuit en van bovenaf	2015	Diegem	
Doc16	Research paper	Van Bouchaute, Bart	Solidariteit in superdiversiteit: het transformatief potentieel van een complementaire munt in een superdiverse wijk	2015	Diegem	

Doc17	Thesis	Van Reusel, Hanne	Reflection paper: Scratch, scar, score in shuffle mode	2014	Ghent University	
Doc18	Thesis	Vanleene, Daphne	THE CO-PRODUCING CITIZEN: A case study on the motives affecting citizen participation in community development	2014	Ghent University	
Doc19	Newspaper Article	Geert Herman	Rabot houdt van Torekes	2011	Not Applicable	het Nieuwsblad
Doc20	Magazine Article	Pascal Debruyne	Bruggen naar het Rabot DZJOEF	2006	Victoria Deluxe, Vooruit Kunstencentrum en Samenlevingsopbouw	DZJOEF
Doc21	Magazine Article	De redactie	Unassigned	2011	Not Applicable	Express
Doc22	Magazine Article	Dimitri Vandenberghe	Wonen in de Torens van het rabot	2011	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	FRANK 1
Doc23	Magazine Article	Wouter Van Thillo en Tom Dutry	Toreken de complementaire munt	2011	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	FRANK 3
Doc24	Magazine Article	Pascal Debruyne	Special stadsvernieuwing	2013	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	FRANK 8
Doc25	Magazine Article	Dimitri Vandenberghe	Community building	2015	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	FRANK 12
Doc26	Magazine Article	Anika Depraetere & Bart Van Bouchaute	De Torekes: alternatief waarderingssysteem	2015	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	FRANK 13
Doc27	Magazine Article	Herman Peeters	Volhoudbare stadsvernieuwing	2015	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	FRANK 14
Doc28	Web Page	n.a.	Project 'De Torekes' wint Oost-Vlaamse prijs voor sociaal-cultureel volwassenenwerk	10/11 /2015	FOV	
Doc29	Web Page	n.a.	Complementary currency	10/11 /2015	Community Currency Gateway	
Doc30	Web Page	n.a.	De Site in cijfers	10/11 /2015	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	
Doc31	Web Page	n.a.	Over de site: projectorganisatie	10/11 /2015	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	
Doc32	Web Page	n.a.	Project: Bruggen naar Rabot	10/11 /2015	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	

Doc33	Web Page	n.a.	Opdracht	10/11/2015	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	
Doc34	Web Page	n.a.	Medewerkers	10/11/2015	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	
Doc35	Web Page	n.a.	Nieuwe Ideeën	10/11/2015	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	
Doc36	Web Page	n.a.	Waarom	10/11/2015	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	
Doc37	Web Page	n.a.	Welkom bij Torekes!	10/11/2015	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	
Doc38	Web Page	n.a.	Werkwijze	10/11/2015	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	
Doc39	Web Page	n.a.	Wij zijn wij	10/11/2015	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	
Doc40	Web Page	n.a.	De Site	10/11/2015	Stad Gent	
Doc41	Web Page	n.a.	Deelprojecten Bruggen Naar rabot	10/11/2015	Stad Gent	
Doc42	Web Page	n.a.	Tijdslijn	10/11/2015	Stad Gent	
Doc43	Web Page	n.a.	Bruggen naar Rabot	10/11/2015	Stad Gent	
Doc44	Web Page	n.a.	EFRO	19/01/2016	Europese Commissie	
Doc45	Web Page	n.a.	Boerenhof	19/01/2016	Not Applicable	
Doc46	Web Page	n.a.	Boerenhof	19/01/2016	Stad Gent	
Doc47	Web Page	n.a.	Geschiedenis Rabot	20/01/2016	Stad Gent	
Doc48	Web Page	n.a.	Contact & Partners	20/01/2016	Stad Gent	

	Type	interviewer	Interviewee	Year	Organisation	
Int1	Expert Interviews	Vanleene, Daphne	Opbouwmedewerker (Community worker) #1	14/04/2016	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	
Int2	Expert Interviews	Vanleene, Daphne	opbouwmedewerker (Community worker) #2	18/04/2016	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	
Int3	Expert Interviews	Vanleene, Daphne	beleidsmedewerker(Policy Advisor)	22/03/2016	Samenlevingsopbouw Gent	
Int4	Expert Interviews	Vanleene, Daphne	Wijkregisseur (District director)	13/04/2016	Stad Gent	

ANNEX 3: NVIVO DATA TREE

The tables below are transferred from the Nvivo program. The first column indicates the concepts used to code the data coming from either the document analysis (Data tree #1) or the expert interviews (Data tree #2). This operationalisation was made in three steps: firstly, a literature review on previous research gave a first idea (Vanleene et al., 2015), followed by a discussion with the Community Development professionals as well as colleagues which resulted into Annex1. However, as the data tree formed, some clusters were shaped inductively. In the second column, the number of sources, i.e. documents or interviews, that are coded into that specific cluster can be found. The third and last column, references, indicates the amount of sentences, paragraphs or words that have been highlighted by the researchers into that code.

DATA TREE #1: DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

Operationalisation Research Questions		Sources	References
A. CONSTRUCTION CO-PRODUCTION		36	236
1. Subprojects		15	23
	The Farmstead	4	7
	The Site	9	10
	Similarities between the projects	1	1
	Torekes project	5	5
2. Paid Employees		15	30
	Partners	9	13
	Professionals' roles in the process	9	17
3. Citizen Participants		19	57
	Age	3	3
	Citizen's roles in the process	15	23
	Nationality	5	13
	Numbers	6	13
4. Mission		25	98
	Goals	19	39
	Intended direct results	7	8
	Intended target audience	5	11
	Unintended results-issues arising	1	1
	Wicked problem	16	39
5. Content		11	36
	Conflicts (handled)	3	14
	Relationship between professionals - citizens	7	9
	Who decides-steers the case	8	13
6. Outcome		11	28
	Environmental benefits	4	5
	Material benefits	5	9
	Social benefits	8	14
B. ELEMENTS OF CO-PRODUCTION		15	53
1. Professional Support		12	26
	Information – Transparency of the organisation	1	4
	Innovative ways to reach citizens	7	11
	Investment in the projects	8	10

	Inability to 'enable'	1	1
2. Competence		1	6
	Psychological access	0	0
	Physical access	1	6
	Negative accounts	0	0
3. Salience		6	21
	Altruistic reasons	1	1
	Material motives	1	1
	Personal motives	4	9
	Social motives	5	6
C. DEGREE OF DEMOCRATIC QUALITY		11	35
1. Inclusion		2	6
2. Empowerment		10	26
	Actual Influence	8	11
	Autonomy	6	15
3. Equity		1	2
	Fairness in outcome	1	1
	Fairness in process	1	1
	Satisfaction w services	0	0

DATA TREE #2: EXPERT INTERVIEWS

A. CONSTRUCTION COPRODUCTION		4	50
1. Subprojects		1	1
2. Paid Employees		4	12
3. Citizen Participants		2	4
4. Mission		4	18
5. Content		3	5
6. Outcome		2	10
B. ELEMENTS OF CO-PRODUCTION		4	80
1. Professional Support		4	36
	To Ask	4	18
	To Enable	4	10
	Organisation's investment	4	8
2. Competence		4	19
	Physical access	2	8
	Psychological access	3	8
	Self-confidence	2	2
3. Salience		2	25
	Impact	2	7
	Length	0	0
	Significance	2	18
C. DEGREE OF DEMOCRATIC QUALITY		4	42
1. Inclusion		4	7
2. Empowerment		4	24
	Actual influence	4	15
	Autonomy	4	9
3. Equity		4	11
	Fairness in outcome	3	6
	Fairness in process	4	5
	Satisfaction w services	0	0